Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein.

In an effort to conclude prosecution, claims 1, 3, 12, 19, 26, 28, and 30have been amended. New claims 31-32 have been added. Thus, claims 1-32 are pending.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11-14, 19, 21-25, 26, 28, 30 remain rejected as being obvious over Lewis (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,388) in view of a DirectTV reference obtained from the Internet "waybackmachine" web site.

Claims 1, 3, 12, 19, 26, 28, 30 have been amended.

Claims 1, 12, 19, 26, 28, 30 all now recite providing content to a receiving device (or equivalent) having an associated identifier, where the recited key needed to decode protected content is based at least in part on the associated identifier for the receiving device. Neither Lewis nor DirecTV teach or suggest protecting the segments of the set, but not the other segments of the group, with protection requiring a key **based at least in part on an associated identifier associated with a network address for the receiving device** of a receiver as recited.

Consequently, it is submitted that claims 1, 12, 19, 26, 28, 30 are presently in condition for allowance. Regarding dependent claims 2, 6-11, 13-19, 20-25, 27, 31-32, while these dependent claims introduce further limitations distinguishing claimed embodiments over the documents relied on by the Office, Applicants submit these dependent claims are presently allowable for at least the reason as depending from

allowable base claims. However, regarding dependent claims 8, 15, 20, 27, 29, and 32 in particular, it is submitted the art relied on by the Office fails to teach or suggest the recited combination of an identifier associated with a network address and a remote computer number and the incident limitations operating thereon.

Regarding claim 3, it has been amended to be in independent form because the documents relied upon by the Office fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements including selective content protection with a key including the remote computer number. The Office admits (page 7) that "Lewis does not disclose key to include remote computer number" but continues on to state that the DirecTV "license plate" is equivalent in combination to Lewis with what is recited. Applicants disagree.

As recited, the remote computer number is tied in to the key used to protect content. For the combination of Lewis and DirecTV references to render claimed embodiments obvious as suggested, the combination **must** teach or suggest that the identifier be used to protect portions of the content. Applicants submit there is no such teaching with the documents relied on by the Office. There is no such teaching in DirecTV since the referenced portion of DirecTV at page 19 ("Why does the DSS system require an access card? How does it work?") only discloses an access card key that controls whether the enclosing satellite receiver is authorized to operate. As best this DirecTV reference is understood, an invalid card results in **total operational loss**.

The cited portion of DirecTV does not teach or suggest using the access card to selectively protect content as recited. The Examiner is requested to turn attention to page 17 of DirecTV ("Why am I receiving a change card message on the TV?") which

states "If you have not already done so, it is important that you change to your new card IMMEDIATELY **or you will experience a loss of programming**.") If we ignore for the moment that such total operation loss is incompatible with Lewis' teaching of playing portions of a DVD, and hence these documents would not be combined as suggested, even if the DirecTV teaching were nonetheless combined as suggested by the Office with Lewis, the result is a DVD player that either will or will not work at all, depending on whether a correct key is known. The combination does not result in the selective protection as recited in the amended claims. Hence, the documents relied on by the Office cannot render claim 3 (and hence dependent claims 4-5) obvious.

The other rejections to the claims not addressed directly herein are believed to be moot in light of the amendments and discussion above.

"Waybackmachine"

Re the DirecTV Applicants maintain there objection to the DirecTV reference since the Office has failed to prove that the waybackmachine web site is a reliable resource. That is, unlike a dated printout, the waybackmachine is a web site comprising ephemeral data that may be changed at any time, and hence it is submitted that the data is unreliable. Notwithstanding this, it is submitted that the actual date of the DirecTV is nonetheless moot since as discussed above the DirecTV access card fails to teach or suggest the claimed (as amended) selective content protection.

JC55 MAY 05 2004 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims **1-32** are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Interview Request

If the foregoing amendments are not deemed to place all claims into allowance, prior to issuing a subsequent Action, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone to discuss the present application as such discussion is believed likely to further examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2004

Steven D. Yates
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 42,242
(503) 264-6589

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026